



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/519,861	12/29/2004	Yasuo Ishiguro	82478-9900	9295
21611	7590	02/29/2008		
SNELL & WILMER LLP (OC) 600 ANTON BOULEVARD SUITE 1400 COSTA MESA, CA 92626			EXAMINER BADAWI, SHERIEF	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2167	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			02/29/2008	PAPER

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

<b>Advisory Action</b> <b>Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief</b>	<b>Application No.</b> 10/519,861	<b>Applicant(s)</b> ISHIGURO ET AL.	
	<b>Examiner</b> SHERIEF BADAWI	<b>Art Unit</b> 2167	

**--The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --**

THE REPLY FILED 04 February 2008 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.

1. ☒ The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on the same day as filing a Notice of Appeal. To avoid abandonment of this application, applicant must timely file one of the following replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit, or other evidence, which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in compliance with 37 CFR 41.31; or (3) a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply must be filed within one of the following time periods:
- a) ☒ The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date of the final rejection.
- b) ☐ The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.
- Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).

Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) ~~180~~ in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

#### NOTICE OF APPEAL

2. ☐ The Notice of Appeal was filed on \_\_\_\_\_. A brief in compliance with 37 CFR 41.37 must be filed within two months of the date of filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal. Since a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed within the time period set forth in 37 CFR 41.37(a).

#### AMENDMENTS

3. ☒ The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because:
- (a) ☒ They raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);
- (b) ☐ They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below);
- (c) ☐ They are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or
- (d) ☐ They present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.
- NOTE: \_\_\_\_\_. (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).


4. ☐ The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121. See attached Notice of Non-Compliant Amendment (PTOL -324).
5. ☐ Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): \_\_\_\_\_.
6. ☐ Newly proposed or amended claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).
7. ☒ For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) ☒ will not be entered, or b) ☐ will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.
- The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:
- Claim(s) allowed: \_\_\_\_\_.
- Claim(s) objected to: \_\_\_\_\_.
- Claim(s) rejected: 1, 5, 13-18.
- Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: \_\_\_\_\_.

#### AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE

8. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but before or on the date of filing a Notice of Appeal will not be entered because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and sufficient reasons why the affidavit or other evidence is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).
9. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a Notice of Appeal, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to overcome all rejections under appeal and/or appellant fails to provide a showing of good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1).
10. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation of the status of the claims after entry is below or attached.

#### REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER

11. ☒ The request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: See continuation.
12. ☐ Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s). (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s). \_\_\_\_\_.
13. ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_.

  
 JOHN COTTINGHAM  
 SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER  
 TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100

As per Claim 1;

Applicant argues that Kraft does not teach "a field information holding unit holding for each of the plurality of user IDs and search purposes corresponding to procedure relating to patent"

The previous argument is recited in the amended claims, which has been amended to associate user IDs with the search and display flags, the amendment requires further search and consideration.

Applicant argues that Kraft does not teach "storing field information as display flags for each of a plurality of user IDs"

Examiner respectfully disagrees, the argument recited is not recited in any of claim 1 limitations, furthermore the user ID association with display flags has been introduced in the amendment of the claims post the final office action.

Applicant argues that Kraft does not teach "the user of user IDs, and the user IDs should be in conjunction with the search purposes"

Examiner respectfully disagrees, the argument recited is not recited in any of claim 1 limitations, furthermore the user ID association with display flags has been introduced in the amendment of the claims post the final office action.

Applicant argues that Kraft does not teach "a field display unit displaying, in accordance with the field information, the data-entry fields for which the display flags for the user ID have been set"

The previous argument is recited in the amended claims, which has been amended to associate user IDs with the search and display flags, the amendment requires further search and consideration.

As per Claim 16;

Applicant argues that Kraft does not teach "the field receiving unit receives from the user, a selection of two or more data-entry fields that are to be used for conducting the search"

Examiner respectfully disagrees, Figures 5-7 clearly display multiple fields that can be used to enter search, the fields being added and used for specifying the search are also data entry fields which would read on claim 16 limitation.

As per Claim 17;

Applicant argues that the combination of Kraft and Dasan does not teach "a user ID input unit to accept a user ID wherein the display flags are associated with the user ID such that the display flags are preserved when the user ID is accepted at a subsequent period of time"

Examiner respectfully disagrees, wherein Dasan teaches in paragraph.10, lines 1-10 (the claim provides an identification of the user-defined profile), furthermore Dasan clearly discloses creating a profile associated with the user and preserving the user setting such as flags on Fig. 8-10 (case sensitive flag fig.8 and news editor flags fig.10), furthermore the user can edit such settings. Furthermore the step of displaying and displaying the flag has been previously presented by the Kraft reference therefore the combination of Kraft and Dasan discloses the above argued limitation.

As per Claim 15;

Applicant argues that the combination of Kraft and Lee does not teach "data entry field of international publication number and unexamined patent publication number.

Examiner respectfully disagrees, claim 38 of Lee clearly discloses storing foreign and international patent publications that could be searched.

As per Claim 18;

Applicant argues that the combination of Kraft, Dasan and Kasahara does not teach "wherein the display flags have a value of 1 if the display flags have been set, and the display flags have a value of 0 if the display flags have been cleared"

Examiner respectfully disagrees, Kasahara clearly discloses the ability to change display values from 0 to 1 based on the property of the display object, (col.7, lines 56-65), the combination of Kraft, Dasan and Kasahara discloses setting a value 0 or 1 based on the condition of the flag.